THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Rev. F. Bertram Clogg, B.D., Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, University of London, has published a book containing a large amount of useful expository material on *The Christian Character in the Early Church*.[1] It is the fruit of much diligent study of recent books on the early period of the Christian Church, and more especially the period covered by the New Testament documents. If the arrangement of the material is not all that could be desired, reference to it is facilitated by a careful index of New Testament passages.

Professor Clogg seeks to make the point at the outset of the discussion proper that whereas there is much that is abstract in Aristotle's conception of the 'high-minded' man, we can build up from the writings of St. Paul a concrete conception of the Christian character. Both the pagan and the Christian are ideal conceptions, but in reading St. Paul's exhortations to the good life we do not feel ourselves in the same sense in the realm of the abstract as in reading Aristotle's analysis of the activity of the soul in accordance with virtue.

We should like to quote part of the concrete picture of the Christian character which Professor Clogg presents to us from St. Paul's writings: 'It is that of one who, like the Stoic, endures hardship and suffering with fortitude, but who, unlike the Stoic, does not count insensibility, dispassionateness (ἀπάθεια) to be a virtue: of one who is compassionate, kind, forgiving, long-tempered, debonair, considerate, and sweetly reasonable; ready to waive his rights rather than to push them to the extreme; humble, as recognizing his absolute dependence on God; accepting insults and injuries as God's means of purifying the soul; of one who is not aggressive or self-assertive; who gladly defers to others; magnanimous, but not conceited; master of himself in all the temptations of the flesh; an embodiment of the things men most highly prize, the dignity and freedom of personality.'

There is more to be said before the picture is fully before the reader. But the most important thing that emerges is that the Christian character, as we may build it up from St. Paul's descriptions of it, finds both its starting-point and its goal in Christ. This certainly ensures that it is no abstract type of the good and virtuous life. And Professor Clogg goes on to show that the Pauline conception of the Christian character can be illustrated from most of the other (than Pauline) Epistles of the New Testament, as can also its relationship to the earthly life of Jesus.

There follow expositions of the character of Jesus in the Gospels and Acts; of the Christian character in the teaching of Jesus, in the light of the Jewish ideal, and in contrast with the Gentile (more especially, the Stoic) ideal; and of the Christian character in the developing Church (more especially, as portrayed in the Epistle to Diognetus). It is only part of a complete scheme, but in present circumstances Professor Clogg has had to abandon the intention with which he began this study.

Among much of interest and help in these expositions we draw special attention to the comparison of the Pauline and the Stoic ethics. It is a subject which has been often treated. Professor Clogg acknowledges a special debt to Bishop Lightfoot's essay on 'St. Paul and Seneca.' But it is a sufficiently important subject to be reconsidered now and again. For, as Professor Clogg says, 'in the first century A.D., apart from Judaism, Stoicism was the noblest expression of a profound sense of moral order in the universe and of man's duty to conform to it; of the dignity of human nature; and of the brotherhood of all mankind.'

For St. Paul the good life is not one of unconditional obedience to a written and traditional law. It is a product of the Spirit, springing from fellowship with Christ. Accordingly, the Christian must exercise moral judgment; he must prove or approve the things that are good. It is through the freedom that comes of the Spirit that this is possible. And yet St. Paul has to recognize that complete freedom from law is not possible. However, the law is fulfilled in one word, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Here is the

[1] Epworth Press; 10s. net.

regulative principle in Christian conduct and character.

Now while the wise man who was the ideal of the Stoic had many characteristics in common with the Christian as delineated by St. Paul, there is a significant difference between the Stoic and the Christian conception of sin. For the Stoic sin is that which is contrary to reason, to nature, to the law of the universe in which man is placed. It is not, as for the Christian, a breach of the relation of man to a God whom he is bound to love and to obey, an offence done to the will of a loving and gracious Father.

Again, the freedom from anxiety that is enjoined upon the Christian (' in nothing be anxious '—Ph 4^6) is something quite different from the sovereign principle of Stoicism, dispassionateness (ἀπάθεια). ' The wise man is not disturbed from his composure, indeed he is insensible to the sufferings and sorrows of others; and this not from hardness and inflexibility, but from his superiority to all disorders of the mind.' But it is only because of his life in Christ that the Christian is sufficient for all circumstances.

Again, alongside of the sterner type of goodness which has affinity with Stoicism St. Paul sets a new, gentle, and forgiving type. As Percy Gardner has said, ' It was not Stoicism but this type which transformed human relationships, did away with the harshness of slavery; abolished gladiatorial shows; checked the harshness of relations between governed and governing race and race. This gained power over the barbarians; made them feel the vanquished populations were to be protected, not exterminated; set before them nobler views of conduct and religion.'

Other points of difference between Stoic and Christian morals are brought out in these pages. But it is worth reiterating that the courage of the Christian—his patience, long-suffering, endurance, to which St. Paul so often refers—arises from his conviction that he has learned the deepest secret of self-sufficiency and can do all things in Christ who gives him the strength.

Mr C. S. Lewis is the nearest thing to Chesterton that we have to-day. It is not a matter of imitation, but a similar kind of mind, that delights in startling paradoxes and challenging impossibilities. He is also essentially orthodox, in a broad sense of the word, and altogether on the side of the angels. In his latest book, *The Abolition of Man*,[1] these characteristics are abundantly illustrated. The sub-title is ' Reflections on Education with special reference to the teaching of English in the upper forms of schools.' But that is not the real subject.

[1] Milford; 2s. 6d. net.

The real subject is the authority of objective values which are the necessary foundation of ethics and much else. Mr. Lewis does begin with education, or rather with two schoolmasters and the book they have written for the guidance of their pupils. He calls the book ' The Green Book,' concealing its real name, and the teachers are also anonymously Gaius and Titius. They contend in their book that when a man says of a waterfall ' that is sublime,' he seems to be making a remark about the waterfall but in reality he is making a remark about his own feelings. What he was saying was: ' I have feelings associated in my mind with the word Sublime,' or shortly, ' I have sublime feelings.'

Mr. Lewis thinks this disastrous teaching. The schoolboy who accepts it will be led to believe two things; first, that all sentences containing a predicate of value are statements about the emotional state of the speaker, and, secondly, that all such statements are unimportant. But if these assertions are true, then what has until quite modern times been believed is clearly false, namely, that objects did not merely receive, but could *merit*, our approval or disapproval, our reverence or our contempt. Mr. Lewis quotes many examples of this belief, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, Christian, and Oriental. And what is common to them all is something we cannot neglect.

It is the doctrine of objective value, the belief that certain attitudes are really true, and others really false, to the kind of thing the universe is and the kind of things we are. To call children delightful or old men venerable is not simply to record a psychological fact about our own parental or filial emotions at the moment, but to recognize a quality which *demands* a certain response from us whether we make it or not.

Over against this stands the glorification of the subjective. Those who maintain it profess to be cutting away the parasitic growth of emotion, religious sanction and inherited taboos, in order that ' real ' or ' basic ' values may emerge. Mr. Lewis's book is a searching examination of this position. What ground can we find, he asks, for holding that these entirely subjective values are real or basic? He mentions two possible arguments—that they are useful or that they are instinctive. He takes as a crucial case the con-

tention that a man should be ready to die for a good cause.

Is this to be justified on the ground that it is useful to the community? But why should any one be induced to give his life for this reason? Such a sacrifice means simply that the death of some men is useful to other men. That is true, but on what ground are some men asked to die for the benefit of others? Every appeal to pride, honour, shame, or love is excluded by hypothesis. But if we say, 'this sacrifice will preserve society,' we are not saying something that will lead to the injunction 'do this,' unless by the mediation of 'society ought to be preserved.' You cannot get a conclusion in the imperative mood out of premises in the indicative mood.

Equally unsatisfactory is the argument from instinct. To begin with, *is* there an instinctive urge to such sacrifice? Mr. Lewis says he is not conscious of one in himself, and 'much less do I feel it easy to believe that the majority of people who have sat opposite to me in buses or stood with me in queues feel an unreflective impulse to do anything at all about the species or [about] posterity.' It is difficult to assign such a motive unless to a reflective man. The truth is that neither in any mere statements of fact nor in any appeal to instinct can we find a basis for a system of values.

In the absence of any subjective source for objective value Mr. Lewis draws this conclusion, that what may be called Natural Law or Traditional Morality or the First Principles of Practical Reason or the First Platitudes, is not one among a series of systems of value. It is the sole source of all value judgments. If it is rejected all value is rejected. If any value is retained, it is retained. There never has been, and never will be, a radically new judgment of value in the history of the world. The rebellion of new ideologies against the objective reality is a rebellion of the branches against the tree. The human mind has no more power of inventing a new value than of imagining a new primary colour, or, indeed, of creating a new sun and a new sky for it to move in.

Mr. Lewis began with a school book, and he never loses sight of the imperative necessity of basing the life of youth on reverence for what he calls the Tao, this objective reality out of which all goodness and truth come. He is really dealing in a fresh and fascinating way with the old question, Why should we be good? Because goodness is good for us, the subjectivists say, or because we feel an instinctive urge to goodness. But neither of these reasons furnishes a motive to self-sacrifice or humility or purity. They are both debateable as mere propositions, and neither of them conveys an imperative injunction. Nothing does this unless what is in the nature of things.

But does that not mean *God*? Mr. Lewis has a short paragraph in which he says that, though he is a theist, indeed a Christian, he is not in this book attempting any indirect argument for Theism. 'I am simply arguing that if we are to have values at all we must accept the ultimate platitudes of Practical Reason as having absolute validity; that any attempt, having become sceptical about these, to reintroduce value lower down on some supposedly more "realistic" basis, is doomed. Whether this position implies a supernatural origin for the Tao is a question I am not here concerned with.'

Yes, but that *is* the question. Why should the Practical Reason have absolute validity? The subjectivists may properly ask Mr. Lewis that. And, here at least, he has no answer. He has certainly disposed of the naturalistic pretensions of the subjectivist. There is no authority in utility or in instinct that can impose itself on the human mind. But is there *any* authority that does this except the only thing that can be imperative, the will of God? We should like to hear Mr. Lewis on that, in a postscript to this suggestive and able book.

The New Order.

V. Biblical Principles and Social Progress.

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.

II.

The New Testament cannot be understood apart from the Old, and much of what we have been saying is presupposed in the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles. In one respect we note a striking difference when we pass to the New Testament. The Old Testament is full of utterances which bear directly upon political and social events; it is largely concerned with the life of a particular nation, and some of its authors are themselves statesmen. The New Testament has almost nothing which could be called a pronouncement on current political or social problems. It is true that many political theorists have claimed to have the support of Jesus; He has been cited on the side of almost every kind of social ideal, from the divine right of kings to the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the very variety of these claims shows how little ground there is for any of them. The famous saying about rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's has been made the starting-point of elaborate political theories, but it may be doubted whether it was the intention of Jesus to lay down any principle of political philosophy; at any rate, we are not told what things are Cæsar's. St. Paul, in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, certainly has some memorable remarks on the divine sanction of secular authorities—'the powers that be are ordained of God'—but they are plainly very far from being exhortations to social reform. Probably there were groups in the primitive Church which felt deep hatred for the secular power, but they have left only one witness to their passion in the New Testament—in the Book of Revelation.

It must strike every reader of the New Testament as astonishing that one institution which to us is utterly contrary to the mind of Christ should never be denounced. St. Paul has no word to say against slavery, and in writing to those who are slaves he exhorts them to serve faithfully. The truth is that the writers of the New Testament as a whole have no interest in the problems of contemporary social and political life. There is a reason for this. They did not expect the present order to last long. They had no vista of developing centuries before them. At any moment, they believed, the course of history would be brought to an end by the coming of the Lord in the glory of the Father. It seems to me that it would be well if those who turn to the New Testament for direct guidance in social matters would bear this fact in mind.

There are, of course, many passages in the New Testament which have been taken, and rightly taken, as the expression of the noblest principles and ideals of social living. The idea and the experience of fellowship are central in the Apostolic religion, and such phrases as 'if one member suffer all the members suffer with it,' 'we are members one of another,' have worked powerfully in building up a sense of responsibility for the whole human race, but we must note that in the New Testament they refer, not to the secular community nor to the whole of humanity, but to the Church. There is one passage in the New Testament where we seem to be confronted with an idea very closely akin to that of progress. The writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians, says, 'Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' We are reminded of the humanist doctrine of the perfectability of man through progress in understanding, but there is really a profound gulf between the secular humanism of the religion of progress and the Christian humanism of St. Paul. He is speaking of 'the building up of the body of Christ' and his vision is that of a Church which has completed its mission by 'growing up in all things unto Him who is the Head, even Christ.'

The preaching of the Gospel began with the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, and this, the original form of the good news, has seemed to many to be closely connected with social progress. How often have we heard work for social amelioration described quite simply as work for the Kingdom of God, and all too frequently we have been invited to accept the particular political or social programmes which the speaker advocates as a substantial instalment of the Kingdom. As we all know, the meaning of the phrase 'Kingdom of God' in the Gospels is the subject of great discussion and might be described as the burning question in Biblical theology. It would be out of place to attempt to summarize a difficult contro-

versy here, and I must be content with stating, somewhat dogmatically, some conclusions which, to me at least, seem beyond serious doubt. First, the Kingdom or Reign of God is the gift of God; it is brought in by His gracious act and in the fulfilment of His purpose. This fact at once differentiates the New Testament thought of the Kingdom from the current ideas of social progress. There is no foundation in the Gospels for the belief that the Kingdom can be achieved by the effort of men. Jesus says to His disciples, 'Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.' Secondly, we are bound to remark that the Kingdom has a dual aspect. On the one hand, it is definitely in the future and many passages in the Gospels suggest strongly that the coming of the Kingdom was expected very shortly, within a generation; on the other hand, the Kingdom is, in some sense, already present; it can be entered or received by those who hear the words of Jesus. These two aspects do not really conflict with one another; they can be reconciled by the distinction between the coming of the Kingdom in the hearts of those who obey the Gospel and its coming in power hereafter. Thirdly, we have to recognize that the coming of the Kingdom in 'power' is neither the result of an historical process nor is it itself an historical event in the ordinary sense. It is the end of history, and it has its existence in a new order of things—a new heaven and a new earth.

It may be said that this complex of ideas and images is so different from those associated with progress that there can be no real connexion between them, and this is partly true. Indeed I think it is important to dwell upon the difference, because we are all too ready to interpret the teaching of the New Testament in the light of modern Utopianism. Nothing could be further from the truth. The preaching of the Kingdom is almost the opposite of the notion that, at some future date, there will be evolved a society perfectly harmonious and satisfactory. On the contrary, it implies that in this present world man has no abiding city, and never will have one.

Nevertheless, it is only partly true to say that the Kingdom of God has no relation with progress. It has a most significant indirect relation with it. Professor A. N. Whitehead has pointed out that Christianity possesses a criterion of social progress, and, perhaps alone among the religions and philosophies, can answer definitely the question how to distinguish advance from retrogression. The laws of the Kingdom, laid down in the Sermon on the Mount and in the other ethical teaching of our Lord, are not capable of being literally fulfilled in the imperfect societies of our present history. 'Resist not the evil man'; 'give to every one who asks'—such admonitions can be obeyed only in an approximate manner; always compromise enters into our actions, because we have to think of the consequences of our acts. The absolute morality of the Gospels, however, gives us the test by which all societies must be tried and the objectives of our endeavour. A society is good in so far as it approximates to one in which the absolute ethic would be the normal rule of conduct—in other words, in so far as it is a true fellowship in the creation and enjoyment of the good. The Christian, therefore, if he understands the implications of his faith, will certainly not be less ardent a worker for progress than his humanist neighbour; he will be a more effective one and less easily discouraged, because he will have a clear objective and he will know that the value of his service is not to be judged only by its apparent success in this present order. To put the matter in the form of a paradox, he will be a better soldier of progress just because he does not believe in the religion of progress.

Closely connected with the Kingdom of God is another New Testament principle which has had a profound effect on our civilization—the value of the individual. Much of our sociological theory—even that which is governed by Christian motives—is concerned with great generalized and collective concepts like civilization, humanity, race, romanticism, realism, to quote a few at random. No doubt, such terms are useful and necessary, but we sometimes wonder if we, or even the authors, know exactly what they mean. It is salutary to turn sometimes from sociology to the New Testament, for there we have very little of the abstract and very much of the concrete. Where sociology and theology speak of 'humanity,' the New Testament speaks of men. Even the far-reaching principles which St. Paul throws out in his letters, as if they were asides, are couched in language which looks towards the individual. Theologians may write of the fall of man or the redemption of the human race; St. Paul writes, 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' The value of the individual person, so far as the New Testament is concerned, is based upon two facts about him—two religious facts—he is created by God to be His child and he is the object of God's redeeming love, which is manifested in Christ. The influence of these two beliefs on political thought and action has been incalculable. The presuppositions of democracy have their roots in Christianity. I affirm this, fully recognizing that there were city-states in the Greek world which are called democracies, but the difference between ancient democracy and what we mean

by the term is evident when we ask who constituted the *demos* in Athens and what rights had the large slave population.

The idea of equality has played a large part in the struggle for social progress, and we take for granted that no society can be really good in which grave inequalities exist; but the reasonableness of equality is not so obvious that we can call it self-evident. One thing is quite certain—persons as we know them in experience are very far from being equal, in ability, in virtue, or in usefulness to the community, and to treat individuals as equal who are evidently unequal can hardly be called a rational proceeding. It is only when we take a religious view of man that we begin to see a principle in which some kind of equality can reasonably be ascribed to all men. If the deepest truth about every person is that he stands in direct relation with God and is the object both of God's judgment and of His love, then we know a fact so tremendous that the difference between one and another in respect of ability and the rest are relatively unimportant.

The Christian and New Testament conception of the nature of man has a direct bearing upon a question which has become very acute and will perhaps be even more important in the future. The rise of totalitarian states of various kinds inevitably poses the problem of the rights of the individual. Has the community, or the State as its organ, unlimited power over the individual? Has it the authority to command anything without limit and to demand the entire devotion of the individual member? I note that purely secular philosophies of politics have great difficulty in finding ground for the assertion of the rights of man and some have frankly abandoned the idea, holding that a man has no rights except those that the State gives him. This subordination of the individual to the Society cannot be tolerated by those who adopt the principles of the New Testament. It is the person and not the State or the Nation who is in direct relation with God. It is he who will be judged, and though the life of a civilization or national state may endure for centuries, the individual person alone is the heir of immortality and more permanent than any of his associations.

I have left myself no time to dwell upon a principle of the Bible which is perhaps more fundamental than any other—that new societies can be made only by new men. 'Ye must be born again.' 'In Christ we are new creatures.' These notes are characteristic of the New Testament, and not at all characteristic of our current social idealism. The popular notion is that, if you can change the environment and adjust the arrangements of political and economic life, you will ensure progress—the persons will look after themselves. No Christian would deny that the institutions of society must be reformed in accordance with reason and justice, but he would maintain that the creative power is to be sought in the souls of men. Our social order, our economics, our cities, our very buildings, reflect our souls and minds. If we are mean, self-seeking, frightened little people, we shall have mean and sordid societies; if we are touched by the spirit of Christ, we shall build beautiful cities and societies, which will be homes for men and not workshops or prison houses. Is this not necessary doctrine for our time? It is good to readjust the machinery, but not if we forget the one thing needful, the remaking of the human self.

A passionate desire for progress has become the dominant note in modern ethics. The typical 'good man' of our time is one who labours earnestly for the welfare of the coming generations and loves his neighbours yet unborn even more than those who are now living. So much is this the case that we may regard the religion of progress as one of the most effective and widely held in the contemporary world. Recent events have perhaps shaken the belief of some in the steady march of progress, but not the conviction that progress is a worthy object of endeavour. The Christian faith, as we find it in the New Testament, has certainly no condemnation for such sacrifice for the good of those who shall come after us, but it definitely holds that the religion of progress by itself is a false religion. To serve the future of humanity is not enough, and, in the long run, will prove unsatisfying. The true end of man is, not some earthly paradise in a problematic future, but to know God and to become partakers of His eternal life. In every age, in the most hopeful and splendid as well as in the sordid and despairing, comes the word of the Gospel, 'Be not fashioned according to this age; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God' (Ro 12^2).

Literature.

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM.

The question of how the great living religions of the world—not excluding Christianity—will develop in the changing world of to-day and what influence they will exert in the world of to-morrow is one to which we all would desire to find the right answer. Are they all on the way to the everlasting bonfire or will they renew themselves and live on and make fresh conquests? Islam is still a very living influence in many lands and only yesterday it seemed powerful enough and united enough to threaten the peace of the world. The question of its present vitality and of its future is discussed in an interesting little book by Dr. Laurence E. Browne, Professor of Comparative Religion in Manchester University, *The Prospects of Islam* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). Professor Browne has personal experience of the Muslim situation as it is seen in India, which has more Muslims within its borders than any other single country. His knowledge of the religion and his contact with its adherents, viewed from the vantage-ground of the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies in Lahore, give this book a real importance for those who desire to understand whither it is journeying.

That it is journeying towards materialism would be the opinion of a good many, but Dr. Browne does not agree with this without qualifications. 'This is a process,' he says, 'which has gone further in Turkey and Egypt than in Persia and much further than in India.' That is a judgment of the situation in India which Dr. Browne would not make unless it was well grounded. He goes on to say that the number of those in India who ignore the fast of Ramadan 'must be very few indeed.' One would rejoice to be as confident of this as Dr. Browne is but the reviewer cannot but remember that fourteen years ago he lunched with the staff of the Muslim University at Aligarh during Ramadan and only one out of some twenty-five Professors was keeping the fast that day. It was the opinion then of Arya Samaj Hindus in Lahore that materialism was making more rapid progress among educated Muslims than among educated Hindus. Probably, however, Dr. Browne is able to base his opinion on a knowledge of what is happening among other circles than the intellectuals.

Dr. Browne sees three particularly valuable religious elements in Islam which he hopes will be handed on to future generations—its worship in the sense of its recognition of the greatness of God, its sense of brotherhood between Muslims, and its zeal. These things of real religious value are, he affirms, being preserved by Muslims who have been converted to Christianity, and he gives some evidence to prove the truth of this claim. 'We may confidently look forward,' he says, 'to the time when all that is good in Islam will be preserved in the Christian Church.'

That is a heartening hope, and it is affirmed here by one who surveys the prospects of Islam in a broad and generous spirit. He sees Muhammadanism reaching a high level of spiritual insight when, as he puts it, 'Sufis looked to Jesus,' and Sufism obtained an acknowledged place in Islam 'through the labours of that great man al-Ghazzali who died in A.D. 1111.' He goes on to tell how ten years ago he gave an account, to an audience of Muslim students in Rangoon, of that period in the history of their religion, and suggested that 'the hope of Islam was to pick up the threads of that search.' The response of his audience, he says, showed that they 'realised that the Sufis of that age were on the verge of a great discovery and that the history of Islam would have been very different if they had pursued their search.'

This is a wise and able study, full of insight and sympathy, and it should be read by every one who is concerned for the future of the Islamic peoples.

NICOL MACNICOL.

PACIFISM.

On Earth Peace, by Communicants of the Church of England, edited by the Rev. Percy Hartill, Archdeacon of Stoke-on-Trent (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net).

This book, like its predecessor, 'Into the Way of Peace,' owes its inspiration to the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, and its ten writers are united at least in a general point of view. Among these are Professor Grensted and Mr. Middleton Murry, and any book in which they have a hand will be treated with respect, for we owe much to both of them. The other writers are not so distinguished, but they are by no means negligible and their contributions will be read with interest.

The foundation of the argument is laid by Dr. Grensted's essay on 'God's Way with Evil.' He is not in love with the name of 'pacifist,' but he recognizes that there must be a word to describe his standpoint, though he would much prefer to equate pacifism with Christianity. At any rate it expresses the faith of 'those who believe that peace on earth is God's will, and that it can only be brought into being, under God, by those who seek and take His Way.' But that is precisely the position of the Christian who is not a pacifist. And the crucial point is: What *is* God's way? How does God deal with evil? The pacifist answer is that 'evil is judged by Love's silence and Love's endurance. . . . There is no trace of force, as men understand it, anywhere in the picture. It was repudiated by Jesus in the first days of His ministry, when He faced evil in the wilderness, and He remained consistent in that repudiation to the end.' That is the main pacifist contention, and in considering it two things may be said. One is that Jesus did not repudiate force 'as men understand it.' One of the outstanding things in the gospel picture is His anger, and this declared itself in the actual physical force with

which He drove out the traffickers from the Temple. Dr. Grensted speaks of 'the strange, symbolic "cleansing of the Temple".' But there is nothing either strange or symbolic in that event. Jesus found a state of things in which the poor were being fleeced and exploited, and He not only resented this but expelled those who were robbing their brethren.

The other thing which seems to me open to criticism is the interpretation of 'God's way with evil.' Do we not find a true, if imperfect, revelation of God in the world about us? in His treatment of men and of evil in men? One of the basal facts of life is retribution (of good as well as of evil). The world is built on retribution. And if we believe, as we rejoice to do, that God is love, then retribution must be regarded as an expression of that love. 'The love of God,' writes Dr. Grensted, 'is not something which has somehow to be reconciled with His Justice, His Power, and His Creative Energy, a process which can only result in a patchwork God and divided loyalties in man. . . . The Justice and the Power and the Creative Energy of God are nothing else than His Love and are not separate categories. . . .' We may agree generally with this, but most of us would prefer to say that God's love is expressed in His Justice and Power and Creative Energy as well as in His compassion and patience and sympathy. In St. Paul's words we would say: 'Behold the goodness and severity of God,' and if we are to deal with evil in God's way we have to follow the way of severity as well as the way of goodness.

Mr. Middleton Murry leaves the religious point of view entirely on one side and deals with the possibility of political pacifism. The political condition of world peace, he says, is the surrender of national sovereignty, and as Mr. Murry sees no prospect of any nation making this surrender his hope of world peace by political means is extremely slender. His article is realistic and pessimistic, and with his general contentions most people will probably agree.

F. J. Rae.

THE FAITH OF ISRAEL.

Isn't it about time that we got back to the reading of our Bible, and especially of the Old Testament? We have books in plenty about the Old Testament—translations, old and new, theologies, histories, introductions, and countless other 'helps' to Biblical study, but it must be confessed that we comparatively seldom have any real attempt to get inside the minds of the writers, and see what man and God looked like to them. We read ideas into their words; that is, perhaps, to some extent inevitable, but it is but rarely that we hear, for instance, a preacher who impresses us as standing where prophet and psalmist stood. The need for such approach will be brought home to every reader of *The Challenge of Israel's Faith*, recently published in Chicago by Dr. G. Ernest Wright (University of Chicago Press; 9s. net). In six chapters, none of them long, Dr. Wright presents us with a fresh and vigorous interpretation of the message of the Old Testament, which he has been able to approach with far fewer preconceptions than most scholars do. They deal with the nature of inspiration, the meaning of history, the claims and character of God, the ideal community, and the ultimate hope of the future. The emphasis is sometimes rather individual, and might not always be endorsed by readers, but, nevertheless, the book is instructive, interesting, and inspiring. Above all, it insists on the primary importance of getting back to the actual text of Scripture and winning the divine message therefrom.

T. H. Robinson.

HILDA MARTINDALE.

Hilda Martindale has made a notable contribution to the history of the emancipation of women in her new book *From One Generation to Another* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). She has combined successfully a memoir of her mother, a brief outline of her sister's life and her own autobiography, and in a very modest fashion she has revealed the great influence wielded by the trio in their enthusiastic and disinterested work for women.

Her mother, Louisa Martindale, was a daughter of James Spicer and shared the zeal for social reform of that philanthropic and Liberal-minded Congregational family, and this she passed on to her daughters combined with an education and outlook in advance of their time. Hilda, on leaving the Royal Holloway College, took up social work in connexion with State children, and the betterment of conditions for the younger generation is the form of service that has lain nearest her heart throughout her career. In 1901 she was offered a post as one of H.M. Inspectors of Factories at the Home Office which she accepted, and she remained at the Home Office until 1933 when she was appointed Director of Women Establishments at H.M. Treasury. At this time the child in Industry was a considerable problem; many thousands from twelve years were employed on the half-time system in textile factories, a large number were occupied with sweated labour in their own homes and others were illegally employed in other directions. 'The never-failing willingness of children is a trait which needs careful watching,' she remarks. 'Undoubtedly,' she writes, 'the mass of information I was able to collect on child labour was taken into consideration when the Employment of Women, Young Persons, and Children Act of 1920 was framed, sweeping away completely all employment of children under fourteen years of age in factories and workshops.' Many experiences of child labour came to her in Ireland, where she was appointed English Inspector of Factories in 1905. Here she found Laundry work absorbing much juvenile labour, and Rescue Homes and Orphanages competing with trade laundries. In the former, little girls of nine years of age were sometimes employed from 9.15 to 6.45. The result of her inquiries brought such institutions more closely under the law. Her inquiries into child labour in flax-spinning areas, and her encounters with the pernicious system of Truck recall certain passages in Disraeli's *Sibyl*. Truck was largely stamped out in England by the

Truck Act of 1831 but was still rampant in Ireland, particularly in Donegal which abounded in 'outworkers' doing exquisite needlework at starvation wages. The valuable work of the Irish Agricultural Organization led by George Russell ('A.E.') was of great assistance to her, and she writes warmly that Russell never failed her in support while she was in his country. The health of women workers and their safe-guarding from accidents in Factories demanded close attention, and on the eve of many of the cases she was obliged to take to Court telegrams would arrive from her mother bearing such stimulating messages as 'May you save many girls' lives to-morrow' and 'Life will be easier for women of the next generation.'

The remainder of this absorbing book deals mainly with the industrial problems of the last war, the surprising ability of women to fill the places of enlisted men—notably in Engineering—the formation of a Welfare Department, and with Outside Welfare, in which Hilda Martindale took a very active part. She ascribes the prevalence of women and girls in Public Houses to the fact that 'Most of them had nowhere to sit, their lodgings being over-crowded. . . . What I longed to see were Winter Gardens, well-lighted and well-warmed where the girls could come and rest . . . where they could be supplied with really good refreshment and some light drinks; where a band would play; and a room was reserved for dancing. . . .'

The post-war years were filled with constructive work, and during her time at the Treasury she did much to further the interests of women in State Departments.

At the close of her book she says that she is accustomed to writing 'accurate and detailed reports' but not to expressing herself on more indefinite lines. The austerity of her wording in presenting the facts of individual and collective cases of hardship she has known leave a more lasting impression on the memory than any florescence of style could achieve; while as a result of her experiences there emerges for the reader in a clear light the vast and ever-changing scope for humanitarian labour lying before women following in her profession.

MILDRED ROBERTSON NICOLL.

If the Christian wishes to see how a Jew discusses Judaism with other Jews, then let him read Dr. Ignaz Maybaum's *Synagogue and Society* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net). The whole attitude is completely different from that of any Christian point of view, and is not easy to understand. The style is difficult, and the translator's knowledge of English idiom is limited. He cannot possibly mean some of the things he says. Our chief problem is, Wherever did the author get his knowledge of Christianity? Certainly not from any Protestants in this country, nor from the Lutherans in Germany. He seems to imagine, so far as we can gather, that the priest, as mediator, is essential to Christianity, and it is on this basis that he contrasts the Synagogue and the Church. What he says may be true about Catholicism, but it is not true of the Churches of the Reformation. Apart from this, the book is illuminating, and especially his discussion of Paul and the Pharisees on p. 75 f. Such sidelights as this do a very great deal not only towards enabling the Christian to understand the Jew, but also towards enabling the Christian to understand himself.

Christ and Public Opinion.

BY THE ARCHDEACON OF BODMIN, CANON W. H. RIGG, D.D.

WE can hardly overestimate the importance of public opinion in a democratic society where it can function freely, and men can express their opinions without let or hindrance. To disregard it is the height of folly. Even under a national-socialistic government like Germany, whose citizens go in daily fear of the Gestapo, those in authority cannot afford to ignore it altogether, the proof of this being the attention given to propaganda.

Public opinion is all-pervasive. Sometimes it expresses itself in a noisy fashion, but its influence is most powerful when people are least aware of it. Far more than many of us like to admit, it fashions our ideas and moulds our opinions. It takes on a variety of forms, *e.g.*, public opinion in a school is somewhat different from what it is in the world outside. At my old school 'swagger rules' were observed with a rigour which no boy, after he had once been told what they were, ever thought of breaking; it simply was not done. No lad ever dreamt of wearing his bluer or blazer open until the beginning of his third summer term. To sneak or tell tales of another boy to a master was an unforgivable offence and never forgotten. In a small community, like a country town or village, public opinion is more uniform than in a large industrial city. There are certain people who must have their fingers on the pulse of popular opinion. Those who own a cinema must always be asking themselves whether a particular picture they put on will be acceptable to the majority of their clients. The successful journalist is one who knows how to excite the interest of his readers and hold their attention. The politician voices the needs and aspirations of public opinion. If

he is really a great man he impresses his personality upon the public and is able to guide those belonging to his constituency. Professor Stewart's warning is most apt, 'There is a class of whom the world is always worthy and more than worthy: it is worthy of those who watch for, reproduce, exaggerate its foibles, who make themselves the very embodiment of its ruling passions, who shriek its catchwords, encourage its illusions, and flatter its fanaticisms. But it is a poor rôle to play, and it never has been played by the men whose names stand for epochs in the march of history.'[1] Nevertheless the politician, however highminded he may be, cannot afford to disregard the views of his supporters altogether—and their prejudices as well.

Two questions confront us. What was our Lord's attitude towards public opinion, and then, in the light of His teaching what should be our own? First of all, Christ both considered and understood it. Before He came on earth there was a divine preparation of public opinion. St. Paul in writing to the Galatians says, 'But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law' (4^{4}). The people to whom our Lord ministered had been specially prepared by God, by the events of their history, and through His servants, the prophets, so that they might the better be enabled to appreciate the message of the Son of God and welcome Him as the Messiah. Although the Chosen People rejected Him, the author of the Fourth Gospel does not hesitate to say that He came to His own people, and to the woman of Samaria Christ said, 'salvation is from the Jews' (4^{22}). Jesus observed the customs of His own kindred and people. He was circumcized, attended the synagogue every Sabbath day and visited the Temple, and even in His ordinary, everyday attire dressed as a Jew (Mt 9^{20}, Lk 8^{44}). To the man cleansed from leprosy He bade him go, and show himself to the priest and offer the gift commanded by Moses (Mt 8^{4}, Mk 1^{44}, Lk 5^{14}).

Leaving on one side the ecclesiastical authorities public opinion, until the last week of His life on earth, moved very much in His favour. If we may accept the Johannine account, quite early on in His public ministry the disciples of John the Baptist complained that the Prophet of Nazareth was baptizing, and all men came to Him (3^{26}). Towards the end of His time, the Pharisees exclaimed with a certain amount of exaggeration, 'Behold how ye prevail nothing: lo, the world is gone after him' (12^{19}). Both in His Galilean and Jerusalem ministry the people heard Him gladly, the synoptists and the First Gospel in particular enabling us to see how the multitudes followed our Lord from place to place. This was due in no small degree to the way in which He framed His message and, above all, to the force of His personality. Unlike the religious teachers of the day, whose discourses were as dry as dust, and out of touch with the problems of daily life, Christ not only spoke in a language understood by the people so that they heard Him gladly, but their troubles and sorrows were His constant care. Characteristic of good, popular speakers He seldom made use of abstractions and generalities. On the contrary His talks were full of illustrations and short pithy sayings, in the late Dr. Wendt's words, the principle Jesus aimed at 'was the greatest clearness in the briefest compass.'[2] This is also discernible in the Fourth Gospel, though admittedly some considerable allowance must be made for the fact that it is 'a distillation of the life and teaching of Jesus from the alembic of the Apostle's own mind.' Osbert Sitwell has remarked that the work of no author who cannot be quoted is likely long to survive. This most certainly applies to speakers, and how easily the Lord's sayings can be both remembered and quoted. Humour and irony He made use of with telling effect. 'You strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel' (Mt 23^{24}) was the charge He brought against the Pharisees, a sally which the people must have enjoyed, all the more so because the teachers of the day were not at pains to conceal their contempt for the ordinary folk.

Secondly. Although Jesus of Nazareth could gauge to a nicety the feelings of His audience, He was never led away by public opinion. More than any other of the sons of men He showed His independence and, where necessary, deliberately went against it.

There were three crosses at Jerusalem. On two of them were crucified two thieves, and in their midst was Jesus, the Christ. The first were there because they were far behind the standard of public opinion. The second was there because He was so very far in front. In other words, the man who defies public opinion may do so because he is either a criminal or a prophet.

Our Lord had ever before Him the absolute standard of God. 'I can of myself do nothing,' He confesses on one occasion, 'as I hear I judge, and my judgment is righteous, because I seek not mine own will but the will of him that sent me' (Jn 5^{20}). Whenever He saw that it came into conflict with the views of the day, He did not hesitate to denounce the latter, and proclaim His Father's will regardless of consequences.

[1] I owe the quotation to Dr. Moffatt. Cf. his commentary on *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (*I.C.C.*, 1924), 190.

[2] *The Teaching of Jesus*, Eng. Tr., i. 129 ff.

The Saviour's treatment of sinners was unique, and exposed Him to the accusation of being a winebibber and a friend of publicans and sinners (Mt 11^{19}, Lk 7^{34}). 'That a teacher should go about and associate with such persons, and attempt to help them and "cure" them, was,' as the late Dr. Montefiore observed in commenting on the practice of the Rabbis in our Lord's time, 'an unheard-of procedure. That the physician of the soul should seek out the "sick" was a new phenomenon. According to the Rabbis, the visiting of the bodily sick was an obligation and duty of the first order. But the seeking out of the morally sick was not put upon the same footing, nor, so far as we can gather, was it practised. Here Jesus appears to be "original." '[1] Our Lord's actions as well as His words justify the tribute paid to Him by the Pharisees and Herodians, 'Teacher, we know that thou art true, and carest not for any one: for thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God' (Mt 22^{15-22}, Mk 12^{15-17}, Lk 20^{20-26}). They knew this to their cost, for from the very beginning of His public life He had angered the ecclesiastical authorities by criticizing their legalism in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, and the stress they had laid on ceremonial observances at the expense of love, justice, and mercy.

Readers of the Gospels cannot fail to notice the reserve Jesus displayed in putting forth His messianic claims. The people of Palestine longed for someone to appear who would free them from the hated yoke of the Romans. Many false pretenders had arisen and been put to death. When the multitudes beheld the miracles wrought by Jesus Christ their excitement was raised to a fever pitch, and they were convinced that here at last the promised Messiah had arrived on the scene. The writer of the Fourth Gospel actually relates that after the feeding of the five thousand Jesus 'perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king' (6^{15}) felt obliged to withdraw into the mountain Himself, alone. The people were right and were wrong. Right in so far as the true Messiah had come, but their conception of His work and office was entirely wrong. It was both political and materialistic; they thought that a good time was coming when the kingdom would be restored to Israel, and Jerusalem become the joy of the whole earth and, furthermore, that the manna would be restored, and thus the average peasant would be relieved from grinding poverty and his lot made brighter. In contrast to this our Lord's kingdom was spiritual, not of this world nor would it be brought about by force.[2] He was to reign in the hearts of men. When, then, the Lord made His last entry into Jerusalem the enthusiasm of the crowd knew no bounds. They believed that the hour of their salvation had come, but their idea of salvation was not freedom from sin but from the bondage of their enemies. Hence the revulsion of popular feeling which reached its climax on Good Friday when the cry arose from their lips: 'Crucify him, crucify him.' Jesus foresaw all this from the very beginning of His ministry.

Taught by Christ what must be our attitude towards public opinion? We must not go out of our way to flaunt it, inasmuch as it does to a very large extent represent the accumulated wisdom and experience of the past. To-day courage, generosity, fair play, honesty, and the sportsmanlike spirit are held in this country in universal esteem. Cruelty, whether displayed towards children or animals, is severely condemned. As we are creatures of very mixed motives, the fear of public opinion may exercise a very wholesome restraint upon our conduct. Therefore the more healthy is the state of public opinion the better it is for the country and the individual.

On the other hand there is something very fickle about public opinion, as many a statesman and reformer have known to their cost. The Templars in the reign of Philip the Fair incurred the even graver charge of unpopularity. 'It is the habit of vulgar and excitable minds to find the explanation of great popular calamities in the treason of leading men. Again and again in French history the cowardly cry "Nous sommes trahis"' has gone up in the hour of humiliation. It went up now. The Templars, it was said, had betrayed the Christian cause, which it was their special duty to defend. They had conspired with the Saracens. . . . Once let loose, the public imagination poured itself out in an unmeasured torrent of innuendo and attack. The Templars were deprived of an opportunity of reply. Many of them were tortured until from agony they made false confessions. Many were sent to the

[1] *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings* (1930), 319.

[2] There are some interesting remarks on violence in Bishop Henley Henson's Autobiography made on 28th August 1934: 'It is in our secularist age that the greatest and most destructive of all the wars known to human record have been waged. The root of men's criminal violences must lie deeper than the reasons which they offer for them. When the "climate of opinion" was religious, men fought for religion; when society professed the queer creed of dynastic right, their wars were dynastic; then there came commercial, and then national wars; and now wars are, to use the cant phrase ideological, either religious or anti-religious. But always the Kingdom of Satan, like the Kingdom of God, is within men.' *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, ii. 344.

stake. With the connivance of the Pope the Order was dissolved, and its vast resources in money and land were annexed to the use of the Crown.' [1]

Numerous reforms have been initiated in the teeth of public opinion, and those who have agitated for them have often been during their lifetime pursued with obloquy, whilst it has been left to subsequent generations to hold them in honour and build memorials recording their achievements. Others besides the scribes and Pharisees have built the sepulchres of the prophets, and garnished the tombs of the righteous under the vain delusion that had they been living in those days they would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets (Mt 23^{29-31}).

Old-fashioned writers used often to lay stress upon the importance of detachment, meaning by this term that they must not set too much store upon the judgments, favourable or otherwise, concerning the words they said and the line of action they pursued (cf. 1 Co 4^{3}). After all public opinion is not the final court of appeal. The highest tribunal of all is when we stand before the throne of God where many human verdicts will be reversed and infallible decisions given. Public opinion can only see the outside of a man's life and cannot penetrate into the hidden depths of his heart. Thus only a Holy and All-seeing God can behold and judge aright. In an age of popular clamour and much shallowness there is no more steadying influence than the realization of how one day public opinion will be of little value in the sight of Him whose eyes are as a flame of fire. 'The world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'

[1] Cf. H. A. L. Fisher, *A History of Europe* (1935) i. 300.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Commencement Address.

By the Reverend Wilfrid Harper, M.A., Middleton, Manchester.

'Sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions.'—Lu 2^{46}.

The inauguration of a new year in the history of your school with a service of this kind is an occasion which any member of my calling would be honoured to share. Beginnings are always somewhat exciting, whether of a new year, a new tale, a new career, or of that strange, wonderful, unpredictable tale called Life.

For some of you to-day is the opening of a new experience. Others of you are conscious that you must take up your studies with such zeal and earnestness as will carry you safely over the heights of school certificate, or higher school certificate. And a few of you know that your school career is fast approaching its end. One cannot speak at length to these varied grades : one can say that, for all of us, what we do at school, what we allow school to do for us, and what we do for school, are matters of paramount importance.

Do you remember that our Lord of Nazareth also went to school?—not, indeed, to such a school as this. Nevertheless, to school He went, and with excellent effect. He went to the Synagogue, where the Jewish padre gave Him much and varied knowledge: to His parents, from whom He learned the inwardness of family life and discipline, and also (from His father Joseph) the way of earning a living with His hands; He went to Nature, whose spirit He so clearly understood, and to the feet of God. What He learned in these various 'classes' appeared in later days: it all becomes manifest in such important and enduring qualities as patience and perseverance, courage and courtesy. Are these things which we can wisely despise?

Patience—surely one of Nature's gifts to Nature's gentlemen, and something to be sought by us all. It is not clever to slip through work with swift carelessness just because we are somewhat gifted. Sloth is a crime, when, as you are in these walls, dealing with high matters. Watch our Lord of Nazareth fashioning with His hands a yoke for a poor beast of burden, the despised ox. Only an ox, and why be scrupulous? In my younger days we had an infliction called a starched collar; a pleasant enough thing when new and smooth but soon rough around the neck, an irritant and a bondage. How could one think clearly with this constant tyranny? Our protests were vocal and eloquent. That poor ox could have no remedy, however irksome his collar. Our Lord's yokes were not unfinished and irritant: they sat well, and hurt that dumb, patient thing not at all.

If Jesus built a ship, she would travel trim:
If Jesus roofed a barn, no leaks would be left by Him:
If Jesus planted a garden, He would make it like Paradise:
If Jesus did my day's work, it would delight His Father's eyes.

That same patience of our Lord of Bethlehem is seen later in the teaching He gave to His menfolk, disciples who were so slow to learn (as we are still) the real lessons; seen, too, in His contacts with

the official Ministers of Religion, whose hardness of heart had become also a disease of dim vision and deaf ears to the Word of God. Patience, my comrades: 'he that endureth to the end' shall be saved, not only in the sense of religion, but in every good way too.

Perseverance is perhaps an offspring of patience; but is somewhat other, and is of great importance. This is something which marked His study of the Old Testament—His Bible. Certainly He learned it to good purpose, since He discerned the Spirit of it, as well as knew the letter; which is, indeed, true wisdom, the principal thing. How wise Jesus was in the things that really matter is something we discover as we go on: how He perseveres with us, as with Peter, we can understand now. Our Lord of Calvary has conquered despair as well as death: He never gives us up. We are not lost until we give ourselves up. The twin prizes of Christian character (the supreme achievement in this world), and sound knowledge come not because one is well-endowed with gifts and graces but because one bends all native gifts to the business of following on, with St. Paul, until the prize is won.

It is not for me to eulogize courage, when that has been done once for all by Sir James Barrie, in the rightly acclaimed Rectorial Address. 'The lovely virtue,' he calls it. 'The virtue,' said Dr Johnson (Boswell's *Johnson*) 'without which no other virtue can stand: and therefore to be prayed for, more than for bread.' The true Christian is the most courageous of men. And some Christians have found, even in these days, a crowning not less worthy than the lion's den in Rome or the flames which carried St. Joan to Heaven.

We may not omit to celebrate courtesy in highest terms. It is a true mark of God's gentlemen and gentlewomen—how should it not be when my Lord of Bethany was the truest gentleman of us all? That grace and charm and understanding which put all manner of people completely at ease in His presence (except hypocrites and tyrants); His gentleness to broken things (and people) and to all weakness and need, give us our N.S.P.C.C. and N.S.P.C.A., our Barnardo's and St. Dunstan's and all the rest we are so glad to support to-day. Your achievements in the arts and sciences, in drama or sport, will win much acclamation. But your courtesy will be as sunshine on a weary day.

If you leave these walls and halls unenriched and uncultured it will be your own fault. Your patient perseverance, with courage, will carry you through much drudgery. But it is not all drudgery. There is 'the gaiety of Galilee,' as the prayer so fittingly has it: there is 'laughter and song and shout' as we 'turn the great wheel of earth about.' Discipline and delight keep company all through for our better safety.

Years ago a boy received a letter from the Games Master of a famous public school. It came during summer recess. This is what it said:

'My Dear John,—You have been chosen to play for the School Eleven. I do not need to ask if you are willing. But you come into the team on our terms:

(1) You attend every practice;
(2) You keep yourself perfectly fit;
(3) You play according to the rules;
(4) You play for the School not for yourself.—

Yours,

P.S.—God help you, my son, if you let us down.'

'It's Comic, but it's Me!'

By the Reverend Derrick Cuthbert, B.A., B.D., Birkdale, Southport.

'I tell everyone . . . that he is not to think more of himself than he ought to think; he must take a sane view of himself.'—Ro 12^3 (Moffatt).

Dame Ethel Smyth, who died a short time ago, was a very unusual woman. For one thing, she was a distinguished composer and, while many women have become famous as performers of music, women composers are exceedingly rare. So the mere fact that Dame Ethel was a composer is enough to suggest that she was an outstanding person, as indeed she was. A little story about her that has appeared in the *Radio Times* speaks volumes for her wit and her downright honesty.

On one occasion the Art Editor of the *Radio Times* wanted to use a photograph of Dame Ethel which showed her, dressed in cap and gown, conducting an orchestra with more vigour than grace. It was not at all a flattering picture and he thought he had better ask Dame Ethel if she objected. This was her reply: 'I know the photograph well. Please use it if you wish. I know it's ugly, and I know it's comic, but it's me!'

Dame Ethel Smyth had no exaggerated ideas about her personal appearance. Nor, you may remember, had Oliver Cromwell. To the painter who was beginning his portrait Cromwell said, 'Paint me as you see me, wart and all.' He could have turned his face so that the wart was hidden; Dame Ethel could have produced a flattering photograph for the Editor to use. But they did not do these things. They did not think more of their appearance than they ought to think, and they did not mind the world seeing them as they were. And this, although it may seem a small matter, was a mark of greatness in them both.

One of the hardest things in life is to be honest about ourselves. In nothing else are we so eager to make excuses. How often our apologies have a 'but' in them!—'I am sorry I forgot, but——,' 'I regret I said what I did, but——,' 'I hope you will forgive me, but——.' And after every 'but' comes a string of excuses, which are often absurd, designed to hide our forgetfulness, or our bad temper, or our laziness. We are very different from the great Dr. Johnson when he was asked by a lady (who hoped to embarrass him and to plunge him into a flood of excuses) why he had made a certain silly mistake in his Dictionary, and who replied, 'Pure ignorance, Madam!'

Honesty like this, honesty with the world about our imperfections, failures, and follies is hard

indeed. The trouble with most of us is that we are not honest with ourselves about ourselves, in the way that great men and women are. It is because we are pretending to ourselves all the time that we are more handsome, more clever, more good than we really are that we find it so difficult to be frank about our shortcomings with other people. This is a very foolish thing for anybody to do, for it only leads to unhappiness in the end, but for a Christian it is foolish beyond words. Jesus is only able to make us the splendid folk He wants us to be if we are honest with ourselves, and with Him, about ourselves. During His earthly life He gave victory over evil to many who were degraded and who admitted it, but He was unable to do anything for the Pharisees. He had to leave them as hard and sinful as He found them because, as He said, they were 'play-actors.' They pretended to themselves and to the world that they were better than they were and therefore He could not help them. If we want Him to help us to become the kind of folk we long to be (and foolishly pretend we are already) we must be honest with ourselves about our weakness and our sin; honest with ourselves and with Him.

The Christian Year.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Thanksgiving and Adoration.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR H. H. FARMER, D.D., WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

'One God and Father of all, who is above all.'—Eph 4^6.

We are to think in this sermon of Prayer as Adoration and Thanksgiving.

It is not difficult to see that the part that adoration and thanksgiving must play in Christian prayer is quite indispensable. For if the regulative aim of Christian prayer is the affirmation of God's redemptive will, the furthering of God's saving work, in the world, it is most necessary always in such prayer to be deeply possessed with the sense that it is the will and the purpose of *God*, the most high God, the God who is above all, with which we are concerned and which is concerned with us. Without that, the prayer will go astray, and we shall go astray with it. We shall in fact be the wrong sort of people to pray, and indeed to serve God's saving purpose in the world very effectively at all.

Thus, first, in the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving the Christian lifts up his heart to the God who is above all, in that He it is upon whom all things utterly depend. He is Creator; without Him we and our world would not be. He is Preserver; without Him we and our world would vanish away. From Him, and from Him alone, cometh down every blessing of this life. Yea, even the evil of life is held within the grip of His manifold wisdom, His steadfast and saving purpose of good. Not even a sparrow falls to the ground without His knowledge.

Now observe how the sense, continually renewed in worship, of everything hanging thus 'suspended from the wrist of God' puts the Christian man in the way of becoming at once very humble and very strong, a combination of qualities as difficult to achieve as it is most necessary to the effective service of God. He is taught humility by the daily penetration of his soul in worship with the truth that he is nothing, and has nothing, nothing whatever, in his own right; that even for the bare fact of existence he is a dependent and derivative being. How much more then for every gift and power for which men, in their folly, are accustomed to praise, not God, but one another? In the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving, he accepts everything from the hand of God and gives everything back into the hand of God for the service of His kingdom. On the other hand, he becomes strong, very strong, in that service. For by this truth also his soul is possessed, that these high and critical issues of God's kingdom, while they demand his service, do not depend upon it. They depend not on his working and contriving, but upon the God who is above all, and outside the orbit of whose wisdom and power nothing can fall. It is, indeed, not difficult to recognize the Christian man who has been deeply shaped by these thoughts of God through adoration and thanksgiving. He has an unshakeable and undefeatable quietness and steadiness and strength and peace. And it is not difficult to recognize the Christian man who has not been so shaped. He worries about God's cause in the world. He has an irreligious solicitude for God. He denounces bitterly the sins of his time. He clamours for campaigns of feverish revival. He fusses round the ark of God, and wants to steady it at every jolt in the road. He is the anxious, striving Christian. His heart is not garrisoned by the peace of God. He needs a clearer vision of the God who is above all. He needs to learn the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving.

Then, second, in the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving the Christian lifts up his heart to the God who is above all in the infinite, unfathomable mystery of His being. Of this it is difficult to speak. The religious man, the worshipping man, knows what is meant; the irreligious man does not, and the most carefully chosen words cannot bridge the gulf. It is enough to say that this is not a matter of merely acknowledging, because we must and with regret, that there is much we do not know, and perhaps cannot know. Such agnosticism, which need in itself be hardly more than a bald statement of fact, can go, as we are all aware, with a jaunty and self-confident humanism, which, however, is always on the brink of a profound despair. No, the agnosticism of the Christian in the presence of God has joy in it. He would not have it otherwise. There is praise in it. There is worship. *Deus cognitus deus nullus*—known God, no God. So you have the exalted, almost excited, tones of the Apostle's great agnostic doxology at the end of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judg-

ments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever.'

Observe, once again, the reflex effect of such worship on the Christian, the servant of God's saving purpose in the world. By such prayer of adoration, and perhaps only by it, he is saved from that which has so often manifested itself in certain types of intense Christian piety and service—a certain 'palliness' with God and a certain readiness to confine Him, as it were, within the narrow dimensions of our own ecclesiastical forms and enterprises. This is the more easy because such forms and enterprises are in all sincerity dedicated to the service of His purpose in the world. By such prayer the Christian is saved, too, from being overwhelmed by the dark inscrutabilities of man's existence in the world. The dread mystery of much in our life is continually taken up, and in a measure lost in, the worshipful mystery of God. A sceptic once said to a saint 'I cannot believe in God in face of a cholera microbe.' To which the saint replied, 'Don't be flippant.' The sceptic is probably still wondering what he meant.

Third, in the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving the Christian lifts up his heart to the God who is above all in His utter holiness, in His infinite and inexhaustible goodness and majesty and truth. Here, again, words become a poor vehicle of meaning. But here again the worshipping man knows what is meant, even though but dimly and in a way that cannot be expressed. And from such worship he goes forth to the service of God in the world a humbler and a bigger man. Humbler, because without the least affectation and make-believe he knows that his best righteousness, set against the splendour of God, is as filthy rags. Bigger, because of an abiding sense of the illimitable Goodness which overarches and interpenetrates our otherwise so little life—for ever beyond us yet for ever offering itself to us to share. The basis of all great living is reverence. But reverence must have an adequate object, otherwise it grows idolatrous and corrupt. The only adequate object of reverence for man is God, known to be now and eternally all that a man could ever dream or desire of perfection, and infinitely more.

Finally, in the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving the Christian man lifts up his heart to the God who is above all in the height and depth and length and breadth of His love, His saving love, towards us in Jesus Christ our Lord. The Christian man knows the love of God in Christ, which nevertheless passes knowledge. At this point adoration and thanksgiving, no matter how far they may range in contemplation of, and obeisance before, the infinite mystery and majesty of the Most High, are firmly brought back again to their distinctively Christian centre, namely God's nature as Love and the redemption that love has wrought in Jesus Christ. It is brought back again to that which is the climax of all right Christian worship, namely the offering which the worshipper makes of himself to God.

For that same love has reached down and redeemed me at so great cost. Therefore, I must give myself without questioning or reserve to its service, in prayer as in all else. The inference is not a logical inference, but it is certainly cogent—to the redeemed and worshipping man; the more cogent because it penetrates deeper than thought to the profoundest springs of feeling in the human soul. 'Love so amazing, so divine, demands my soul, my life, my all.' This is *the* supreme Christian motive, giving the Christian life in all its aspects its distinctive and incommunicable quality—a profound sense of indebtedness issuing in ever renewed wonder, love, and praise, an ever renewed endeavour to repay what in fact never can be repaid.

Yes, the ultimate Christian secret is in that paradox, as someone has said—the paradox that a man has made the one supreme discovery when he realizes that there is only one good thing in life, and that is a bad debt, a debt he cannot repay and has no hope of repaying. Yet because he cannot pay it, he will be for ever paying it, for ever throwing things away into a bottomless pit of unfathomable thanks.

Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Harvest Thanksgiving Day.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.'—Jer 8^{20}.

The Bishop of Chichester, that largely rural diocese in southern England, has pleaded recently for a revival of interest in the old festivals of the Church which relate to agricultural life and in which the whole community joined together with the sense that the pattern of their life was due to the Creator's design. He quotes the words of T. S. Eliot: 'For long enough we have believed in nothing but the values arising in a mechanised, commercialised way of life; it would be well for us to face the permanent conditions on which God allows us to live upon this planet,' and he goes on to urge that a right attitude to the countryside as a gift of God to men that imposes a responsibility for the care of its use and fertility and beauty, and for the health and housing and happiness of its labouring population, is a religious duty.

It is indeed true that war conditions have done much to revive interest in country life. Rationing makes every one food-conscious, and directly concerned about food-production. Every one has felt a personal thrill at news of the prospect of an unprecedented bumper harvest this year in America. Evacuation has brought to many a town-dweller new knowledge of rural ways. People of the city have too often in the past fancied that in their shops and factories and

offices they moved on a higher level in the scale of civilisation than the countryman. It may rather be that the proverb is true, 'Near to Nature, near to grace.' Seed-time and harvest is the Divine order for providing for man's necessities. In the elemental toil of ploughing and sowing and bringing in the sheaves and garnering the fruits, men live near to God's plan and taste the discipline and delight of existence as it was meant to be.

To-day the community is gathered for the Harvest Thanksgiving, and townsfolk, farmer, and gardener are all in the circumstances of this hard day the more conscious of the blessing of the harvest. With all its inventions science is singularly baffled in the attempt to find a way to manufacture nourishment. Food comes by growth. The farmer depends on wind and weather. The universe has been made by a mind with powers and purposes man cannot fathom, yet they are beneficent toward him. This is a habitable world and its provision is lavish and the return in it for man's toil is liberal. Can man expect a blessing with the gifts of the Creator unless he receives them with a grateful heart. So once again let the harvest hymns of praise rise to the Lord of heaven and earth.

A Harvest Thanksgiving might begin and end on this note of pure gratitude and joy. But in these days the zest is gone from all our joys. The summer has brought its pleasantness and the autumn its ripened fields and orchards. Yet the war drags on, and not even the victory that comes nearer will make any sudden end of war's distresses. The harvest text that meets our mood is in the poetry of Jeremiah where in simple words that have a haunting beauty he says the harvest has not satisfied the chief hunger of the soul. Mendelssohn sets the words to music in his *Elijah*. 'The harvest now is over, the summer days are gone.' 'The harvest is past,' says Jeremiah, 'the summer is ended, and we are not saved.'

It is not known exactly what disappointment these words express, what danger or difficulty the prophet had hoped to see overcome before the end of harvest. But it is the poet's gift to utter in words that every man can make his own some elemental truth or emotion that has come to him in his own experience. A lover makes a song out of his own glad or broken heart and lovers all the world over find that it is just what each wants to sing. One need not inquire what exactly was Jeremiah's disappointment. His words are for every one who feels the bitterness of hope deferred and the lack of satisfaction in even excellent results, who finds the goal is never reached but is always round another corner. 'The harvest is past, the fruit gathering is ended, and we are not saved.'

This is a pathetic text, the very one for people sorry for themselves, weary, apprehensive. But do not snatch at the pathos in it. Rather catch at that great word in it 'saved.' Man needs salvation more than harvests. 'We are not saved,' says Jeremiah wistfully—and that is what we needed and hoped for and still expect—'Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? So his faith still breathes. So let men who have gathered their harvest and praised God for it and yet feel heart-weary, still wait with the prophet's undaunted faith for the salvation God can bring.

1. On this occasion and at this date in history one point ought to be stressed. Salvation, as far as it means deliverance in this world from fear and hunger and idleness, must be world-wide. The day of isolationism is past. The nations are now so interlocked and interdependent that there can be no security but collective security.

It is strange to recall that ten or fifteen years ago in times of profound depression the cry went on that prosperity was being destroyed by abundance and that the remedy was in policies of restriction. To-day experts in these matters have a new outlook. There has come to be quite large and general agreement that in an age when science has made abundance easy to attain, there can be no hope of enduring peace and stability and prosperity if some nations live in luxury while others struggle on in want. The one hope is to find work for all in meeting the needs of all.

Here is where religion comes in. Does any one think that nations will learn to give the mutual confidence and make the mutual sacrifices that will be required unless the brotherhood of man is seen as a religious fact. Such schemes are in the air unless men all the world over come to a belief in the Fatherhood of God that embraces all mankind without distinction, race, or culture. The salvation of the world even in this material regard demands a world-wide plan, and the will to execute such a plan requires the same faith in God the Father, through Jesus Christ the elder brother of all which has been the inspiration of the Christian Church. It will take the same kind of love that moves Christian folk to share the gospel to move the peoples to share harvests and markets and live in co-operative peace. 'The harvest is over, and we are not saved,' and we cannot be saved even in a limited sense in this life until the grace of God inspires men to form themselves into such a world community that its establishment will seem a kind of salvation of the world.

2. The other thing to remember to-day as always is that salvation in its deepest sense must also be other-worldly. 'The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.' Every one will be left saying this at last, whether in prosperity or in want, who has not been rescued from dependence on material conditions by a salvation which is inward and spiritual and personal. Jeremiah, this prophet who had little joy in his life or work, was the first great thinker who made the basis of religion not anything public or outward, but a man's own fellowship with his God. 'Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth.' 'They shall teach no more every man his neigh-

bour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.'

When men bless God for the harvest it should be with the recollection that such gifts are like extras thrown in by the way by the Divine liberality. 'Man doth not live by bread alone.' The chiefest praise must ever be for God's redeeming mercy and the promises that are yea and amen in Christ Jesus.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Tragedy of the Empty Soul.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU.

'When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out.'—Lk 11^{24}.

This is an eerie story, but though the setting is weird and full of strange supernatural phenomena, at the same time it speaks to us with the familiar voice of the twentieth century, if we have ears to hear it. It is an age-long truth to which our Lord introduces us, that an empty or unoccupied heart is always exposed to dire peril. The story is essentially a parable and it might be said to be a parable of the soul, either of an individual or a nation. In spite of the mysterious elements in it, the narrative in the main is quite clear.

Here is the story of a house that might be good and lovely, if it were not occupied by a tenant of beastly habits. Instead of being beautiful it has become foul and disorderly. Things have become so bad that the undesirable tenant has been evicted. One might have supposed that 'the unclean spirit' (as he is called) had vanished from the scene for good but he has not departed. Meanwhile the owner of the house has cleaned his house from top to bottom. It is cleansed, but now it must also be beautified. Pictures, curtains, and flowers make it look utterly new. It is swept clean and decorated. What more is required? We understand what that something more is when we read a little further. The owner made no arrangements for a new tenant. Quite oblivious of that fatal omission he goes his way. Tragedy now begins.

For now the old tenant who has been wandering in the open across dry spaces turns up and peers through the windows from the outside. He mutters to himself, 'I will return unto my house whence I came out' and calls his seven companions who are more wicked than himself. Together they all enter the house and dwell there. Then with one of those quietly dramatic touches of which He was master, our Lord says with restraint, 'The last state of that man is worse than the first.' No details are given. The result is too ghastly to describe.

This story was told by Jesus in order that He might bring home to the hearts of men and women the perils that wait upon an empty heart. The empty heart may be the heart of a nation or of an individual. The all-important thing is, first, an accurate diagnosis of the trouble, then the right prescription for a permanent cure. Life affords us many illustrations of the dire malady of the empty soul.

I. First of all, *in the realm of physical health*, Nature will take her revenge upon a life which is devoid of some wholesome and uplifting interest. I read somewhere of a retired business man who said that he felt 'like a broken bed-spring.' The physical examination had revealed no organic disorders, but a short psychological examination showed that the man's mind was like an unfurnished room. It was void of ideas, it had no occupation or interest. A famous psycho-therapist diagnosed his depression as 'a bad case of spiritual emptiness which was being translated into a set of dull pains radiating between ears and ankles.' The prescription was massive doses of reading, prayer, and civic activity. When he filled himself up with constructive thought and activity, there wasn't room for the pain to rattle round. Occupational therapy restored his health.

II. Again, the danger may lie *in the realm of morals and conduct*. Consider the case of a man who has been delivered from the dominion of some 'evil spirit' but has invited no good angels to tenant his life. That man, our Lord would say, is in a very dangerous and vulnerable condition. The vacant soul is always a ready prey to the old evil passions. They know their way in only too well. Sheer ennui will compel the householder to let them in. The old adage is true, 'Satan finds some evil work for idle hands to do.' It is said that Nature abhors a vacuum. If you empty a space of air, straightway a fresh volume of air rushes in to fill the empty space. So is it with the heart of man. It cannot remain empty for long. It is not enough that a man should have the house of his life swept and garnished, he must have it *occupied* as well. Jesus told men that He came to fill them with life. St. Paul, in like manner, exhorted the Philippians to fill their hearts full with things that were pure and lovely and of good report. In our day Sir John Seeley stated this in an oft quoted sentence, 'No heart is pure that is not passionate, no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic.' To fill the mind with lovely thoughts and the life with ennobling pursuits, to fall in love with goodness is to safeguard the soul against the invasion of all subversive influences.

III. Once more the peril of emptiness is seen *in the soul of a nation*. When the soul of a nation is empty of faith and strong permeating principles of virtue, it becomes the easy prey of all sorts of degrading and disintegrating powers. For example we have received many accounts of the youth of Germany from 1933 onwards. They have been described as disillusioned, cynical, and indifferent. They were like rooms—empty, swept, and garnished, ready to welcome the devils who came. But we are bound to admit also that all was not well with our own nation in the years preceding 1939. The Master of Balliol in his latest book writes of a Report which he read, made by the

Carnegie Trust, of an investigation into the state of the young unemployed in South Wales in the summer of 1939. 'These young men had no faith, no hopes, not even any anger: they were completely hopeless and completely cynical. We were, it was clear, preparing for another Hitler.' Dr. Lindsay goes on to say that he had seen traces of the same disillusion and cynicism, of minds as empty of faith and purpose and hope among the students of universities in our own country. The same state of affairs obtained also in the U.S.A. Such then is the diagnosis of our past moral and spiritual inanition. What of the cure?

What of the future? For it is not enough to analyse our past mistakes. We must also plan for the future. Let us then bethink ourselves seriously of our nation's spiritual policy in coming days. Professor John Baillie sounded a warning note when he said: 'If, therefore, our own house should remain as empty as it was fast threatening to become when the day of battle overtook us, could we be sure that we, too, should not soon be worshipping strange gods?' If we merely beat Hitler and his allies, the vacuum will still be there and it will still be abhorrent. If we do not fill it with something good, it will certainly be filled with something evil.

The searching test of the coming years is whether we have a faith clear enough to guide us and strong enough to sustain us in tackling the problems which must be faced and the work which must be done in the upbuilding of the nation's life. It is this dynamic faith and these positive ideals which will save us from the demons which are ready to spring in when peace comes at last. After the storm and tempest have spent themselves, will there be a faith by which we shall be inspired to build with God? For it is only through faith and vision that we shall acquire the poise and steadiness to do the things which matter most. Anything less than that would be unspeakably tragic. If, for example, a spiritual vacuum were to be the end of the gigantic struggle for liberty, and if, exhausted by the internecine contest, and lowered in spiritual vitality, we were to issue an invitation, as it were, to all the demoralizing and anarchistic influences that are abroad. God forbid. Reconstruction! Yes, but how? We shall rebuild only if there is a living faith behind all our efforts. The Church will do well to keep clear before the nation's soul this supreme and practical truth, that not only can Christ cast out demons but that He and He only can fill the soul of a nation with His own beneficent and imperial aims.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Of Those Who are Without.

'Am I my brother's keeper?'—Gn 4^9.

'How shall I go up to my father, and the lad be not with me?'—Gn 44^{34}.

Paul repeatedly speaks with a certain solemn vagueness of 'those who are without'—the mighty host of those who live apart from the faith and the obedience of Jesus. Let us consider our attitude and our responsibility towards them, taking from this rare, human book of Genesis expressions of the two extremes of feeling in this matter. On the one hand is Cain, with his blunt denial of any responsibility—'Am I my brother's keeper?' On the other hand is Judah, by no means a pattern character, who yet is willing to give up home and liberty, if only his young brother may go free. Somewhere between these extremes we all are swaying.

As he appears in our story Judah might easily have pled that nothing could be done. The trap had closed, and this grim governor stood on guard, so they might count themselves lucky that ten of their party should get free and only one be left behind. But within the coarse stuff of his nature there smouldered sparks of fire, and the fire now broke through in a blaze of nobler feeling. Judah felt that there were things he could not do, since honour and self-respect forbade them. The governor might hold him as a slave for life, but better that than to return to his old father, confessing that he had failed in his pledge!

Suppose we change the names and the figures, and take it that, instead of Judah, we are challenged: instead of the lad Benjamin there is in our land and in the world outside, a host of undisciplined and often ill-deserving creatures: instead of the old man Jacob, broken and pitiful, there is in the background Another to whom we must give account. In an Apocryphal Gospel of the fourth century the writer, in describing the Lord's trial, introduces a string of witnesses who had come to tell Pilate of what Jesus had done for them—lepers whom He had healed, paralytics whom He had restored to activity, sinners whom He had cleansed. This, of course, is fiction, and yet it accurately records how Jesus was remembered by those who had no claim except their need. But what procession of witnesses could be mustered to tell of our doings? People whom by our example we might have steadied, whom by greater friendliness we might have cheered, whom by our wisdom and experience we might have saved from disaster; but we had no thought except for ourselves, no leisure of mind and heart for their concerns. Our responsibility, no doubt, is measured by our faculty and by our command of leisure and of money, with which we may be sparingly furnished; yet up to our limit the claim is not to be repelled, and like Judah we should do well to shrink from going back to the Father alone.

1. Like Judah we must begin with the admission that, in a real sense, these folk are our *brothers*. Epictetus says that in the world things have commonly two handles, and that a wise man is careful always to catch at the handle which will bear. If a neighbour has injured you, you may hastily resolve to give as much as you got; but that, says Epictetus, is not a handle which will bear, for what you ought to consider is that the offender is your brother, and nothing can alter this. So far as Judah knew, the boy Benjamin might have been tempted and stolen the cup, in which case he would deserve what he got. In our

Scots proverb, 'Every herring must hang by its own head.' But Judah grasped the situation on the other side; whatever the boy has done he is still my brother, and I must stand by him. The pagan Epictetus would tell us that that is a handle which will bear.

In spite of our selfish instincts man still is dear to man, and we are bound to one another by ties in no sense imaginary. A nation may look as incoherent as a hill of sliding sand, for its citizens are seen suspecting, opposing, denouncing one another, but in the agony of war we have seen how heroically real are these ties of blood. But such an admission carries responsibility with it. In nation and in city we are bound up in one bundle of life with people who started under every disadvantage, whilst to us have been given space, and times of leisure, and clean and various amusements, and a reasonable security about to-morrow (which is a supreme benefit), these others have grown up ill-nourished and undisciplined. We are brothers—they and we—but this contrast in our conditions carries with it an urgency of obligation.

Within the limits of nationality we may grudgingly admit some kind of obligation, but the debt extends much farther, for, as Paul declared at Athens, 'God has made of one every nation of men.' Old Thomas Fuller described a negro as 'God's image carved in ebony'; and the story of Pentecost has received abundant confirmation of its witness that men of every land and every degree of intelligence can yet find the message of Jesus plain and homecoming, as if given in the mother tongue of their homes. This is a lesson which needs deliberately to be laid to heart, for powerful influences are at work against it. Our native selfishness and laziness disincline us for anything which involves effort and expense. It is temptingly easy to believe the malignant gossip against missionaries and their converts, brought from Calcutta or the China ports by people who never saw the real work of missions. And beyond this, there is still amongst us a good deal of that self-centred religion which appears even in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, where the hero turns his back on home and wife and children and the demands of city and nation, concentrating all his thought on his own salvation. But Jesus in His religion imposes duties, and He seeks to turn our eyes away from ourselves to those who are without.

2. 'He is my brother,' that is one point, but we need to add—'my Father loves him.' 'He willeth not that any should perish,' says Paul, and in his Gospel John has set down the immortal declaration that 'God so loved the world as to give His Son.' If at any time questions stir in our minds as to the reasonableness and the hopefulness of missionary effort we need only as Christians to turn again to the Cross, and find there the measure of God's love for worthless-seeming men.

We are going up to the Father with the gathered fruits of life, lessons which we have learned, and tasks we have attempted, and kindnesses and fidelities which we have shown. In these high matters we all are children, and, like children, we must think and talk largely in pictures. We are going to Him, we say, and we would not wish to go with empty hands. One apostolic writer, greatly daring, represents Jesus Himself as thus appearing before God, and saying, 'Behold, I and the children whom God has given me!' These were the men and women to whom He had revealed the glory of life, who had been lost and whom He had found; and with pride and rejoicing He brings them with Him. Any service that we can render to our fellows is inevitably on a different level: it is given to few of us to be the means of saving a man's whole life, but it is not to be despised if we can save even a bit of a life—lessening the sweep of some temptation, bringing interest and distraction into vacant hours. Our Master is not exorbitant in His demands, and Paul, who knew Christ's mind, bids us look not on our own things but *also* on the things of others. In that word 'also' there is a fullness of sober wisdom. Our Lord knows that we have work of our own to attend to and various duties which must not be ignored—to children and dependents and a household; so the precept runs that we look also on the things of others.

In memory of his father, Matthew Arnold records what all of us at least might covet for ourselves:

> But thou wouldst not *alone*
> Be saved, my father! *alone*
> Conquer and come to thy goal,
> Leaving the rest in the wild.
> Still thou turnedst, and still
> Beckonedst the trembler, and still
> Gavest the weary thy hand.
> Stones might have wounded thy feet,
> Toil or dejection have tried
> Thy spirit, of that we saw
> Nothing—to us thou wast still
> Cheerful, and helpful, and firm!
> Therefore to thee it was given
> Many to save with thyself;
> And, at the end of thy day,
> O faithful shepherd! to come,
> Bringing thy sheep in thy hand.

That is a son's tribute to a conspicuous life, greatly employed; and on our humbler level we should make it our ambition in some way to find service also beyond ourselves, thus coming into the fellowship of God's pitying, redeeming activity for those who are without.[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 273.

Entre Nous.

Pray for our Enemies.

Dr. Oldham, in *The Christian News-Letter* for June 28, quotes a letter from a man in the Commandos who has been on active service. 'Speaking out of his individual experience and sense of need, he says: "I say with grief, when I think what the Church of England has meant to me ever since I can first remember, that for the most part we have turned to it in vain; prayers for victory, prayers for our allies, prayers for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, special prayers for Russia, whose government and leaders laugh at them; but in vain have we listened for the words: 'And now let us pray for our enemies, that through God we may be reconciled to them and they to us.'" ' Dr. Oldham then asks: 'How can we sincerely pray for the Germans when we are at the same time killing and bombing them? Is it not sheer hypocrisy? If the God to whom we pray is a God of righteousness and mercy, prayer in the sense intended by our correspondents is compatible with a resolute determination that measures should be taken to prevent Germany from again launching war upon the world, that those guilty of wanton cruelty and brutality should be punished, and that the German people as a whole, who have permitted the Nazi movement to develop, should be compelled to make the fullest possible reparation to the peoples whom they have despoiled. But we shall bungle the whole business, and only lay up stores of trouble for the future, unless in the performance of these necessary acts we learn, however imperfectly, to look on our enemies with the just and compassionate eyes of God—to see them not as mere objects of revenge, but as persons whose restoration as loyal members of the human community must be our ultimate aim. And that difficult, but essential, lesson has to be learned through the discipline of prayer.'

The 'Wagon.'

At the beginning of the war Mr. Alec Waugh, the novelist, was recalled to his regiment and has since served in France, Syria, Egypt, Persia, and Iraq. In *His Second War* he describes his experiences. One chapter contains an unexpected temperance story. 'Though he considered himself a "moderate drinker" he had always believed that wine preferably, but alcohol in some form certainly, was at his age essential to his existence. . . . He had not believed that it was possible for him to enjoy himself without it. It was with some alarm therefore that he faced the prospect of exiling himself on to the "wagon." It was an economic issue, solely. . . .

'It was a relief to find that, after the first three days he could manage very well without his apéritif before lunch and a couple of whiskies before dinner. It gave him a sense of freedom. But it did slightly annoy him to be forced to recognize that as a result of his temperance he now found himself in such irrepressibly good health that he was able to enjoy a number of things that before would have bored him utterly. He hated the idea that perhaps after all the prohibitionists were right.'

The Man and the Mob.

In her recent book, *The Young Lincoln*, Esther Meynell draws attention to 'the sensitive use Lincoln made of an illustration from the New Testament in showing how the differing characters of St. John and St. Peter affected the conduct of the mob towards them. This was in a letter to a friend upon the subject of slavery, and Lincoln said: "John was bold and fearless at the scene of the Crucifixion, standing near the cross receiving the Saviour's request to care for His mother, but was not annoyed"—Lincoln uses this word in the sense of molested—"while Peter, whose disposition to shrink from public view, seemed to catch the attention of members of the mob on every hand until finally, to throw public attention off, he denied his Master with an oath; though later the grand old Apostle redeemed himself grandly." '[1]

Man's Self-Confidence.

The first paragraph in the June issue of *St. Martin's Review* reads as follows: 'Somewhere or other recently we came across the story of a small boy who was asked if he said his prayers in the morning. His reply was: "Of course not. I say my prayers at night because when I'm asleep I can't do anything. But when I'm awake I can look after myself." This tremendous faith in himself, which is both pathetic and engaging in a child, is lamentable in a grown-up. And yet it has been prevalent through all the stages of history. We can only hope that the world-wide disasters of the present century will compel us all to take stock, to give serious thought to a problem which confronts every one of us to-day and will still be there in all the days that lie before us.'

[1] P. 109.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.